

[13th November 1922]

*Schools, etc., for the fishermen community.*

445 Q.—Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development and the hon. the Home Member be pleased to furnish the following information:—

(a) how many schools were started and how many co-operative societies were organized by the Fishery department for the benefit of the fishermen community on the East Coast before the control was handed over to the Labour Commissioner;

(b) what is their condition now; and

(c) whether any more societies and schools have since been organized by the Labour department?

A.—(a) One school and 13 co-operative societies.

(b) The school is working satisfactorily under the control of the Labour department. As regards the co-operative societies, a report has been called for from the officers concerned on their present condition.

(c) Five co-operative societies have been started by the Labour department in the Gōdāvari district, of which two have been registered. The question of starting a society for the fishermen of Karuppur, Trichinopoly district, is under consideration. Six day schools in the Gōdāvari district and one day and night school in the Chingleput district and another day and night school at Narayanaswami Tottam near Adyar have also been started.

*Muhammadan representation in Tiruvottiyur union.*

446 Q.—Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that one Mr. Macdoom Sahib of Tiruvottiyur submitted a memorial to him;

(2) whether it is a fact that there are nine elected members and three nominated members in the Tiruvottiyur union board;

(3) whether it is a fact that there is not a single Muhammadan gentleman amongst them;

(4) whether there was any Muhammadan candidate for the nomination;

(5) whether it is a fact that one Mr. Pattabhiramayya was nominated;

(6) whether it is a fact that Mr. Pattabhiramayya was once a chairman of Tiruvottiyur union until 1918 and was compelled to resign his chairmanship in the Tiruvottiyur union and membership in the Saidapet taluk board and Chingleput district board; if so, under what circumstances; and

(7) whether the name of Mr. Pattabhiramayya is in the electoral list of Tiruvottiyur union board; if not, why not? and whether he has residential qualification required under section 56, Local Boards Act?

A.—(1), (2) & (3) The answer is in the affirmative.

(4) No suitable Muhammadan candidate was available for nomination.

(5) The Government understand that Mr. Pattabhiramayya was nominated by the taluk board president.

13th November 1922]

(6) Mr. Pattabhiramayya was chairman of the union from 1916-1919. During the latter part of this period certain delays in the collection and remittance of the money due to the union were noticed. The then president of the district board recorded the papers as the whole amount due to the union board was fully collected and remitted into the treasury and as he considered that there were several extenuating circumstances in the affair Mr. Pattabhiramayya resigned his membership and it was duly accepted. The Government have no information regarding the resignation of his membership in the Saidapet taluk board and the Chingleput district board.

(7) Mr. Pattabhiramayya's name does not find a place in the electoral roll prepared and published in February 1922. He filed a suit alleging that his name had been maliciously omitted; but the suit was dismissed. The Government understand that Mr. Pattabhiramayya has again resigned his membership in the union.

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"With reference to the answer given to clause (4) of this question, I should like to alter the answer by prefixing the words 'the Government are informed that'."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"Sir, I want to know what the test of suitability of a Muhammadan candidate is. Is it appearance or wealth?"

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"There are many qualifications. In the first place the candidate must not be disqualified according to the disqualifications given in the Act. Many other qualifications are necessary for a successful candidate."

*Representation of the depressed classes in the taluk boards of the South Arcot district.*

447 Q.—Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether there is at least one representative of the depressed classes in each of the taluk boards in the South Arcot district;

(2) whether it is a fact that the Chidambaram taluk board has no representative of the depressed classes;

(3) whether there was at any time a representative of this community on the Chidambaram taluk board; what became of him and whether it is not a fact that one Reddi was appointed in his place; and

(4) whether qualified members of the Adi-Dravida community were available for nomination at the time of nomination; and, if so, why their claims were overlooked?

A.—(1) & (2) There is one representative of the depressed classes in each of the taluk boards of Tirukkoyilur, Tindivanam and Vriddhachalam and none in the Chidambaram or Cuddalore taluk boards.

(3) & (4) The Government have no information.